

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
CAMDEN VICINAGE

ROBERT SCULL,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE WACKENHUT CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Civil No. 10-4633
(RMB/AMD)

JURY VERDICT SHEET

1. Do you find that Plaintiff has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Plaintiff had an objectively reasonable belief that Wackenhut had engaged in an ATL staffing practice that violated a federal law?

Yes X No

If your answer to Question 1 is "No," stop here and advise the Court Clerk that you have reached a verdict. If your answer to Question 1 is "Yes," please proceed to Question 2.

2. Do you find that Plaintiff has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Plaintiff had engaged in a protected activity by raising concerns to Wackenhut regarding an ATL staffing practice he reasonably believed to have violated a federal law?

Yes X No

If your answer to Question 2 is "No," stop here and advise the Court Clerk that you have reached a verdict. If your answer to Question 2 is "Yes," please proceed to Question 3.

3. Do you find that Plaintiff has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Wackenhut terminated his employment in retaliation for engaging in a protected activity by raising

concerns regarding an ATL staffing practice he reasonably believed to have violated a federal law?

Yes

X

No

If your answer to Question 3 is "No," stop here and advise the Court Clerk that you have reached a verdict. If your answer to Question 3 is "Yes," please proceed to Question 4.

4. What sum of money will fairly and reasonably compensate Plaintiff for the damages he has sustained as a proximate result of Wackenhut's unlawful retaliation?

Back Pay (from date of Plaintiff's separation to date)

\$ 400,000

Front Pay (from today forward)

\$ Ø

Please stop.

WHEN YOU REACH THE POINT WHERE YOU ARE INSTRUCTED TO STOP, PLEASE INFORM THE UNITED STATES MARSHAL THAT YOU HAVE COMPLETED YOUR DELIBERATIONS.

DATE

6/21/13

SIGNATURE OF FOREPERSON

[Signature]